

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 73 are presently before the examiner. Applicants have cancelled claims 1 – 73 and submitted for entry new claims 74 – 101. The new claims are fully supported by the Specification and add no new matter. The submission of the new claims renders moot the examiner's rejections, to wit:

1. The "7th choice for X" does not appear in the new claims.
2. R¹ is drawn as a cation when the bond between it and the carboxyl group is ionic and when the bond is covalent, i.e., when R¹ is an ester, it is referred to in proper chemical nomenclature.
3. No dependent/independent claim relationship such as the previous claim 44 dependency on claim 41 or the claim 52 dependency on claim 47 exists in the new claim set.
4. There is no screening claim equivalent to rejected claim 54 in the new claim set, although applicant reserves the right to reclaim such subject matter in a subsequent application.
5. No structure containing dotted lines to indicate isomeric double bonds is present in the new claim set, although applicant reserves the right to reclaim subject matter relating to the different isomers in a subsequent application.
6. No equivalent to claim 59 is present in the new claim set although applicant reserves the right to reclaim such subject matter in a subsequent application.
7. No equivalent to claim 73 is present in the new claim set although applicants reserve the right to reclaim such subject matter in a subsequent application.

In addition, the examiner rejected applicants' introduction of the PO₂ and the SO₂ group in the previous amendment of the claims. While applicant does not agree with the examiner's opinion that these groups comprise "new matter," to facilitate the movement of this application to allowance, the groups no longer appear although applicant reserves the right to reclaim such groups in a subsequent application.

The examiner also objected to claims 10 – 23, 26, 33 – 38 and 60 – 72 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. These claims have all been canceled, thus rendering the objection moot.

Applicant has also canceled the current Abstract and entered a new abstract that comports with the new claims.

CONCLUSION

Based on the new claims set submitted herewith and the above remarks, applicants believe that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that it be passed to issue.

The required fee for the RCE has been submitted with that petition. Applicants believe that no other fee is due with this submission. If this is incorrect, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that is due to 50-2518 referencing billing number 7008382001.

Please address all correspondence regarding this communication to:

Antoinette F. Konski
Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94111

DATE: November 19, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Bernard F. Rose
Registration No. 42,112

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4902
Telefax: (650) 849-4800